UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,435	07/27/2001	William Phillip Gorman	RD - 28615	9715

31450 7590 11/21/2005

MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
100 PINE STREET
P.O. BOX 1166
HARRISBURG, PA 17108-1166

EXAMINER	
STORK, KYLE R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/917,435	GORMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review filed 28 July 2005.

2. Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 9, and 16 are independent claims. The rejections of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 7-11, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towers (Dreamweaver 2 for Windows and Macintosh, 1999, Peachpit Press, hereafter Towers).

As per independent claim 1, Towers discloses a method for developing a web page executable by a web browser (page ix: Dreamweaver is a web page development environment), the method comprising the steps of:

- Opening a visual development environment, wherein the visual development environment includes a visual representation of the web page under development (page 4: Here, a visual development window is shown, depicting a visual representation of a page under development)

- Selecting a field from a plurality of field types to be included in the web page (pages 140-142: Here, a form can be added to a web page. This form is offset by the <FORM></FORM> tags. The visual representation of a page displays the form data between two dashed red lines. Further, the form data contains form objects including: a one-line text box, a multi-line text box, a flock of checkboxes, a gaggle of radio buttons, and lists and menus)
- Inserting the selected field into the visual development environment (pages 140-142)
- Customizing a visual appearance of the inserted field using a visual editor of the visual development environment (page 145: Here, properties of form objects can be manipulated by a web page creator)
- Customizing dynamic behavior (page 233: Here a "Behavior" menu is accessed. This "Behavior" menu allows a web page creator to specify dynamic actions, including "Go To URL" (Figure 6), occur when a specific action, including "onClick" (Figure 7) occur)
- Repeating the steps of selecting a field, inserting the selected field, customizing a visual appearance of the inserted field, and customizing dynamic behavior until all fields are included in the web page (on pages 140-142, Here, the method for inserting form data is disclosed. These steps can be repeated to add a plurality of form fields to a web page. Further, web pages containing several form data fields is shown in Figures 6 and 7)

- Generating, in a single file, program code executable by a web browser to implement the visual appearance and dynamic behavior of the selected fields inserted into the visual development environment (page 4: Here, the web page creation environment is a WYSIWYG tool. All data is encapsulated in a single .htm or .html file)

Although Towers discloses both customizing dynamic behaviors and the use of form fields, Towers fails to specifically disclose customizing dynamic behaviors for form fields. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Tower's use of customizing dynamic behaviors with Tower's use of form fields, since it would have allowed a user to attach events to a form field event (page 233).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Towers discloses incorporating each inserted field into the visual representation of the web page, the incorporating of each inserted field includes incorporating the customizations to the visual appearance of the inserted field and incorporating the customizations to the dynamic behavior of the inserted field (fields may be selectively added on page 142); and displaying an updated visual representation of the web page after the step of incorporating each inserted field into the visual representation of the web page(on page ix, Towers reveals that Dreamweaver is a WYSIWYG web page development environment).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Towers discloses the step of customizing a visual appearance of the inserted field further comprises the steps of: customizing the location of the inserted field in the web page (on page 139, Towers uses a table to customize

field placement); and customizing the size of the inserted field in the web page (on page 145, Towers changes the size of a field).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Towers discloses the step of generating program code, in a single file, executable by a web browser comprises the steps of: instantiating an object for each inserted field (this is inherent because they are form objects, as per page 140), each object being instantiated from a corresponding field type of the inserted field (this is inherent because they are form objects, as per page 140) and including the customizations to the visual appearance of the inserted field (this would be necessary to maintain the individuality of the object, as per page 140) and the customizations to the dynamic behavior of the inserted field (the dynamic behavior of the field is changed on page 229); providing a control engine to execute each instantiated object (when the dynamic behavior of the field is changed, this inherently includes a control engine to execute the instantiated objects; and generating at least one of HTML code and Javascript code to implement each instantiated object, the control engine and the plurality of field types (on page ix, Towers states that it is an HTML tool, implying that HTML code is generated to reflect the page contents).

Regarding independent claim 9, it is a system designed to perform a subset of the method of claim 1. The material in the claim about the server may be rejected using the remote site information of Towers in pages 354-355. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 10, it is a system designed to perform a further subset of the method of claim 1. The visual editors used to create forms are detailed on pages 140-142. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 11, it is a system designed to perform the method of claim 2. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 2.

Regarding dependent claim 14, it is a system designed to perform the method of claim 7. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 7.

Regarding dependent claim 15, it is a system designed to perform the method of claim 8. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 8.

Regarding independent claim 16, it is a computer-readable medium with instructions designed to perform the method of claim 1. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 1.

Regarding dependent claim 18, it is a computer-readable medium with instructions designed to perform the method of claim 7. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 7.

Regarding dependent claim 19, it is a computer-readable medium with instructions designed to perform subset of the method of claim 8. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 8.

Regarding dependent claim 20, it is a computer-readable medium with instructions designed to perform subset of the method of claim 8. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 8.

5. Claims 3-4, 6, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towers, further in view of Boezeman et al. (USPN 5,758,093—filing date 3/29/1996), hereinafter Boezeman.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Towers discloses the step of customizing dynamic behavior of the inserted field comprises the steps of: providing a visual editor for defining properties of the inserted field in response to the selection of at least one particular field type of the plurality of field types (a properties dialog is discloses on page 145); and providing a visual editor for defining control operations for the inserted field in response to the selection of at least one particular field type of the plurality of field types (on page 233, there is an editor for control operations). Towers fails to disclose providing a visual editor for defining error conditions for the inserted field in response to the selection of at least one particular field type of the plurality of field types. However, Boezeman discloses an graphical editor which controls error conditions in col. 5, line 55—col. 6, line 5 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to integrate Boezeman's graphical editor of error conditions into Towers into facilitate synchronization (see col. 5, lines 55-60).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Towers discloses the step of customizing dynamic behavior of the inserted field further comprises the step of defining a plurality of states for the inserted field with the visual editor for defining properties, each state of the plurality of states having a corresponding set of properties for the inserted field (the Properties editor on page 145-146 sets attributes for the fields).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Towers and Boezeman fail to specifically disclose the step of customizing dynamic behavior of the inserted field further comprises the step of defining at least one error condition for the inserted field with the visual editor for defining error conditions. However, the combined invention of Towers and Boezeman has the capability of defining error conditions, and it is beneficial to define error conditions because it prepares the web page for contingencies. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to define at least one error condition because it would have prepared the web page for contingencies.

Regarding dependent claim 12, it is a system designed to perform the method of claim 3. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to claim 3.

6. Claims 5, 13, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Towers, further in view of Boezeman, further in view of Agarwal et al. (USPN 4,713,754—filing date 10/9/1984), hereinafter Agarwal.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Towers discloses said step of customizing dynamic behavior of the inserted field further comprises the step of: defining events for the inserted field and defining corresponding actions for each defined event with the visual editor for defining control operations (on page 233, responses to various events are defined within Towers). However Towers and Boezeman fail to disclose defining dependencies between the inserted field and other inserted fields with the visual editor for defining control operations. However, Agarwal discloses that fields may be interrelated on col. 2, lines 15-40, and it was notoriously well known in the art at the time

of the invention that in a visual environment such as Dreamweaver, editing would occur in a visual manner. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow visual establishment of field dependencies in the manner of Agarwal in the context of Towers and Boezeman in order to facilitate processing of events where fields have a relationship to each other.

Regarding dependent claim 13, it is a system designed to perform a method combining the limitations of claims 4-6. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to these claims.

Regarding dependent claim 17, it is a computer-readable medium with instructions designed to perform a method combining the limitations of claims 4-6. It is rejected under essentially similar rationale to these claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, filed 28 July 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Towers.

The examiner recognizes that although Towers discloses both customizing dynamic behaviors and the use of form fields, Towers fails to specifically disclose customizing dynamic behaviors for form fields. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined

Tower's use of customizing dynamic behaviors with Tower's use of form fields, since it would have allowed a user to attach events to a form field event (page 233).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

krs